

Remarks

The above Amendments and these Remarks are in reply to the Office Action mailed March 7, 2007. A Petition for Extension of Time is submitted herewith, together with the appropriate fee.

I. Summary of Examiner's Rejections

Prior to the Office Action mailed March 7, 2007, Claims 1-7, 17-25, 34-45, 54-65, and 74 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 3-7, 21-25, 41-45, and 61-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite. Claims 1-7, 17-25, 34-45, 54-65, and 74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory matter. Claims 1-4, 6-7, 17-22, 24-25, 34-42, 44-45, 54-62, 64-65, and 74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Park, et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0024812, hereafter Park). Claims 5, 23, 43, and 63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Park in view of Official Notice.

II. Summary of Applicant's Amendment

The present Response amends Claims 1, 3, 17-18, 20-21, 34, 36, 38, 40-41, 54, 56, 58, and 60-61, and cancels Claims 19, 39, 59, and 74, leaving for the Examiner's present consideration Claims 1-7, 17-18, 20-25, 34-38, 40-45, 54-58, and 60-65. Reconsideration of the Application as amended is respectfully requested. Applicants respectfully reserve the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

III. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112

In the Office Action mailed March 7, 2007, Claims 3-7, 21-25, 41-45, and 61-65 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claims 3, 21, 41, and 61 have been amended, and it is respectfully submitted that the Claims, as amended, conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §101

In the Office Action mailed March 7, 2007, Claims 1-7, 17-25, 34-45, 54-65, and 74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §101 as being directed to non-statutory matter. In particular, the Office Action submits that the claims lack a useful, concrete, and tangible result because the claims recite multiple steps wherein an application program interface comprises functions which enable the API

to perform certain operations, and that the claim limitations simply cover anything and everything that does not prohibit actions from occurring. Claims 1, 17, and 34 have been amended, and Claim 74 has been canceled, and it is respectfully submitted that the Claims, as amended, conform to the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §101. Reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

V. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(e)

In the Office Action mailed March 7, 2007, Claims 1-4, 6-7, 17-22, 24-25, 34-42, 44-45, 54-62, 64-65, and 74 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Park, et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0024812, hereafter Park).

Claim 1

Claim 1 has been amended by the present Response to more clearly define the embodiment therein. As amended, Claim 1 defines:

1. *(Currently Amended) An application program interface (API) embodied on one or more computer readable media, comprising:
a first group of services for integrating content repositories into virtual content repositories (VCRs) such that they appear and behave as a single content repository;
a second group of services for manipulating information in VCRs;
a third group of services for searching VCRs; and
a forth group of services for configuring VCRs;
wherein the application program interface is compatible with a content repository service provider interface (SPI).*

Claim 1 has been amended to more clearly define the embodiment as an API embodied on one or more computer readable media, comprising a first group of services for integrating content repositories into VCRs such that they appear and behave as a single content repository, a second group of services for manipulating information in the VCRs, a third group of services for searching VCRs, and a fourth group of services for configuring VCRs. The API is compatible with a content repository SPI. Applicant respectfully submits that these features are not disclosed by the cited references.

Park discloses a system for extracting data from various data sources, converting the extracted data into internal content for management, and integrating internal content with data extracted from existing data sources in real time, in order to publish new services over the Internet (§ [0027]). The services are published by a service publication server that can publish new types of services in addition to all other types of conventional services, including a dynamic search/comparison service that integrates data from various data sources and allows the data to be searched based on search conditions (§ [0035]).

First, it appears that Park is not directed towards an application program interface (API) embodied on one or more computer media. Instead, Park appears to disclose a system directed towards publishing services over the internet. Furthermore, the services disclosed by Park appear to be only web-based services. In contrast, in the embodiment defined by Claim 1, services are comprised by an application program interface.

Second, it also appears that Park does not disclose a first group of services for integrating content repositories into virtual content repositories (VCR) such that they appear and behave as a singly repository. While Park appears to disclose a dynamic search/comparison service that integrates data from various data sources and allows the data to be searched, there is no mention of Park of integrating content repositories such that they appear and behave as a single repository.

Moreover, it also appears that Park does not disclose a second group of services for manipulating information in VCRs or a third group of services for configuring VCRs because, as discussed above, Park does not appear to disclose integrating content repositories into virtual content repositories such that they appear and behave as a single repository.

In view of the comments provided above, Applicant respectfully submits that the embodiment defined by Claim 1 is neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 17-18, 34, and 54

The comments provided above with respect to Claim 1 are hereby incorporated by reference. Claims 17-18, 34, and 54 have been similarly amended to more clearly define the embodiment therein. For similar reasons as provided above with respect to Claim 1, Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 17-18, 34, and 54, as amended, is likewise neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested.

Claims 2-4, 6-16, 20-22, 24-33, 35-38, 40-42, 44-53, 55-58, 60-62, and 64-65

Claims 2-4, 6-16, 20-22, 24-33, 35-38, 40-42, 44-53, 55-58, 60-62, and 64-65 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that these Claims are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also respectfully submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

Claims 19, 39, 59, and 74

Claims 19, 39, 59, and 74 have been canceled, rendering moot the rejections of these claims. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to prosecute any originally presented or canceled claims in a continuing or future application.

VI. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

In the Office Action mailed March 7, 2007, Claims 5, 23, 43, and 63 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Park, et al. (U.S. Patent Publication No. 2004/0024812, hereafter Park) in view of Official Notice.

Claims 5, 23, 43, and 63

Claims 5, 23, 43, and 63 are not addressed separately, but it is respectfully submitted that these claims are allowable as depending from an allowable independent claim and further in view of the comments provided above. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 5, 23, 43, and 63 are similarly neither anticipated by, nor obvious in view of the cited references, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. It is also respectfully submitted that these claims also add their own limitations which render them patentable in their own right. Applicant respectfully reserves the right to argue these limitations should it become necessary in the future.

VII. Conclusion

In view of the above amendments and remarks, it is respectfully submitted that all of the claims now pending in the subject patent application should be allowable, and reconsideration thereof is respectfully requested. The Examiner is respectfully requested to telephone the undersigned if he can assist in any way in expediting issuance of a patent.

Enclosed is a PETITION FOR EXTENSION OF TIME UNDER 37 C.F.R. §1.136 for extending the time to respond up to and including today.

The Commissioner is authorized to charge any underpayment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 06-1325 for any matter in connection with this reply, including any fee for extension of time, which may be required.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 9, 2007

By: /Guanyao Cheng/
Guanyao Cheng
Reg. No. 58,555

Customer No. 23910
FLIESLER MEYER LLP
650 California Street, 14th Floor
San Francisco, California 94108
Telephone: (415) 362-3800